RAJYA SHBHA

Tuesday, the 11th November, 1986/
20 Kartika, 1908 (Saka)

The House met at eleven of the clock, **Mr. Chairman** in the Chair.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Pakistan's nuclear programme

*101 SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that during an interview given by the Prime Minister to Richard Wentraub of the International Herald Tribune on the 13th-14th September, 1986 he had stated that the U. S. Government was 'almost' conniving with Pakistan's nuclear programme;

(b) if so, what are the various aspects of this collusion; and

(c) how do the Government of India intend countering this development?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH): (a) Prime Minister had responded with "Almost" to a question enquiring if he was suggesting that the U.S. Government was winking at Pakistan's nuclear programme.

(b) The present U. S. Government has not used available instruments under existing legislation to halt the non-peaceful dimension of Pakistan's nuclear programme.

(c) Government of India will continue to avail of every opportunity to impress upon all concerned the international dimensions as well as grave implications of Pakistan's programme of acquiring nuclear weapons capability.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister's statement has quoted the exact words used by the Prime Minister when asked by the journalist. The Prime Minister had said that in his view the U. S. Government was "Almost" winking at Pakistan's nuclear programme. Now, this is like saying that somebody is almost pregnant—one is either pregnant or one is not pregnant. Either the U. S. Government is colluding or is not conniving, so this remark coming from the Prime Minister of the country is a very serious charge. It is not being made by any other functionary of the Government, the Prime Minister himself is charging the U. S. Government with conniving at the nuclear programme of a country which has a known posture of hostility to India and which brings about, as the hon. Minister himself has suggested, a qualitative change in India's security environment. Therefore, Sir, there are two aspects. One is about countering, the other is about the aspect of colluding. How therefore is the Government of India countering this measure? I am still not satisfied as to how a charge like the Government of the United States colluding with Pakistan was made by the Prime Minister. But I would leave that, and I would like to know about the countering. My first clarification is about countering this collusion that is now taking place between the United States and Pakistan, and at what time and how is it being countered diplomatically and how is it being countered militarily?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Sir, it is the third day that has fallen to my lot to answer questions on this particular matter or to make a statement before the House, I am now discovering the perils of parliamentary diplomacy. The hon. Member knows, first of all with regard to what the Prime Minister has said. I have read the text of the interview with Mr. Richard Weintraub. This is precisely....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Das Munshi, you are a new Member. You should not cross between the chair and the Member who is speaking.

SHRI P. R. DAS MUNSHI: Sir, I apologise.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: The Prime Minister said "Almost" to a question enquiring if he was suggesting that the U. S. Government was winking at Pakistan's nuclear programme. Now, with regard to what we are doing about it, Sir, as the hon. Member knows, at the diplimatic level we have drawn the attention of the concerned authorities to the mechanisms and instruments like the Symington and Glenn Amendments which relate to the uranium and plutonium technology being used. Then the most glaring case where, I think, they turned the other eye was of Nasir Vaid convicted of attempting to illegally export 50 krytrones of triggering devices. Normally he should have been in jail now. But he was suddenly allowed to leave the United States. Similarly, the strict application of the Glenn and Symington amendments would have made it difficult for Pakistan to go ahead. But a waiver has been given by the United States authorities and this waiver has been given only to Pakistan. We have drawn their attention to it time and again. Only yesterday I read an article by Mr. Nye with regard to the programme. He himself said that there is very little that the United States Government could do now that so much has happened in Pakistan. This is what we are doing diplomatically. We say so in the House. We say it at the ambassadorial level, at the Ministerial levels and other levels.

With regard to the military response, the hon. Member himself having been in the Armed Forces of this great country, knows the realities of the facts of life. The military response to this kind of a thing cannot be announced here. It is, as I said yesterday...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you like to answer that part of it? Why don't you say: "It is for the Defence Ministry to answer it". Now, the second supplementary.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, you have ably protected the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. no. You should not try to get some answers for which he is not responsible. Tomorrow you will charge him saying that he has done this thing.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am sure that the hon. Minister of State is very able and he has had a lifetime experience of diplomacy. Even without your help he would have been able to extricate himself from what was apparently a parliamentary trap.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is, however, my duty to see that the balance is held equally between both the sides. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: This is something we have never heard from the Chair. Your duty is to be impartial between the opposition and the treasury benches. Sir, I submit to you that the Chair cannot ask a Minister not to reply on anything. He may reply on behalf of the Finance Minister also. Why are you bothered? Myself and the hon. Minister, we will just find out a solution. I beg of you. It is not the convention, for your information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just as I protect you, I also protect the Minister.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: It has never been done in the history of Parliament.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: There is one other aspect which was not clarified. The hon. Minister of State has stated quite rightly that both the Houses have been engaged with this matter for the past three days. Perhaps we have already said what was there to be said on the subject. There

is one aspect however which might have been raised in the other House, but which was not raised here. I would request the Minister to clarify it. To me, it is really disappointing that the Government should come forward or that we should be debating this issue only because the news breaks out in Washington Post and a U.S. journalist wrote about it and on account of that a debate takes place in the Lok Sabha and in the Rajya Sabha. It is a disappointment to me as an Indian and as a Member of Parliament. The clarification that I would like to seek is that before Robert Woodword's article in the Washington Post, we had come to learn that the President of the United States had already certified, as it were, to the U.S. Congress. A certification is necessary for arms assistance, etc. We need not elaborate on it. What, therefore, is the Government of India's reaction to this certification by the U.S. President in relation to the news that has broken out later and in relation to what the Prime Minister of India has said about the U.S. collusion with Pakistan in its nuclear Programme?

SHRI K. NATWAR SNIGH: I don't think the Prime Minister used the word 'collusion'. This is as far as I remember and also as far as the transcript of the interview given to Richard Weintraub of the International Herald Tribune is concerned. With regard to the waiver, when the attention of the spokesman of the United States Government was drawn to Mr. Woodword's article, he said that they don't comment on newspaper stories and that the waiver was justified. Beyond this, we ourselves cannot really go.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : सभापति महोदया, मैं मंत्री महोदय की इस बात से सहमत हूं कि अमरीका कन्फ्राईव कर रहा है पाकिस्तान को आणविक अस्त्र देने में और अन्य चीजों के बारे में। मुझे सिर्फ "आलमोस्ट" शब्द के बारे में एतराज है क्योंकि अब स्थिति आ गई है जब हमें स्पष्ट होना चाहिए, भ्रम में नहीं रहना चाहिये। लेकिन फिर भी मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि हमारे विदेश मंत्री यूरोप की यात्रा पर गये थे और पश्चिमी राष्ट्रों से या पश्चिमी यूरोप के राष्ट्रों से उन्होंने इस बिंदू पर उनको अवगत कराया और अगर अवगत कराया, तो उनकी क्या प्रतिक्रिया थी ?

श्री नारायण दत्त तिवारी : श्रीमन्, सम्माननीय सदस्य ने जो जिज्ञासा व्यक्त की है, मेरा अभिप्राय था पश्चिम देशों की यात्रा में, वह आठ विदेश मंत्रियों का एक डेलीगेशन था जो हमारे में जो विश्व नेता हमारे नान-एलाइंड कंट्रीज के एकत्रित हुए वहां हमारे में, उन्होंने यह निर्णय लिया कि आठ विदेश मंत्र दक्षिण अफ्रीका में रंगभेद की नीति के विरुद्ध वहां बायकाट और सैंक्शेस की नीति को अपनाने के लिए जाएं, जिसका नेतृत्व जिम्बाब्वे के विदेश मंत्री कर रहे थे, चूंकि आजकल नान-एलाइंड मूवमेंट के, निर्गुट सम्मेलन का नेतृत्व जिम्बाब्वे कर रहा है।

तो यह एक विशेष परिस्थिति में गये थे, एक विशेष कार्य के लिए गये थे जिसका कि नेतृत्व एक दूसरे देश के नेता कर रहे थे और केवल एक समित जो कि अत्यन्त महत्व का विषय है, उसके लिए कर रहे थे। हमें पांच-छह ही दिन के अन्दर पांच देशों की यात्रा करनी पड़, बल्कि लंदन और पेरिस में तो एक ही दिन में दो विदेश मंत्रियों से हम मिले इसलिये यह सम्भव नहीं था कि मैं द्विपक्षीय वार्ता, बाईलेट्रल टाक्स कोई इस विषय पर वहां कर सकता।

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: Sir, as early as January, 1986, the 'Washington Post' had reported that the Government of the United States of America was in the know of what was happening in Pakistan, particularly as far as developments of this nuclear bomb is concerned. The 'Washington Post" had also reported

at that time that President Reagan was also aware of this fact. In spite of this evidence, Sir, to the contrary, President Reagan on 27th October sent his annual personal certification to the Congress that Pakistan currently did not possess any nuclear explosive device. The matter is serious from the point of view of our country's security. The matter has obviously to be taken up at the diplomatic level. But that apart, since President Reagan is involved and since it is he who has given a clean chit to the Government of Pakistan, the matter has to be taken up at an appropriate level not only with the Government of Pakistan but at a personal level also with the President. I would like to know what the views of the Minister are.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: The hon. Member's suggestion is very worthy of consideration and I shall convey it to the Prime Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. A.G. Kulkarni. You can try to trap.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I do not want to trap, Sir. I was trying to help my colleague and bringing it to your notice that...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Go on.

SHRI A.G. KULKARNI: But, anyway, Sir, I do not want to go into that. Sir, just now my friend has steted and I have also seen that in the 'Washington Post' there are various reports. Sir, the Senate Committee has alleged and stated during the various Congressional examinations that India can produce hundred bombs. At least, this you must have read or you must have noticed or your Ministry must have noticed. This is on one side. Here is a Minister who says that for the last three days it is peril. But we do not see any peril on you. It is very nice that we are discussing for the last three days the security environment of this country in which the whole country is interested. Sir, in September there was a news that some nuclear explosion took place. It was recorded. The Indian side said that it was something like a volcano, etc. So, I do think that all this camouflaging, the entire aspect of nuclear options and your saying that you are keeping your powder dry, etc. does not cut any ice. So, you have to refute that Senate allegation. I am not concerend with diplomacy. Diplomacy has not taken up very far. I have seen for the last forty years that in the name of diplomacy only protest has been going on. At least let us have a Pokharan type of explosion to show to the World that India can do it and we are not at the mercy of the USA or any other super power.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Sir, with profound respect to the Hon. Member, whom I have known for many many years...

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: But courage is required.

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: Sir, I can assure the Hon. Member that neither the Minister of State for External Affairs is lacking in courage nor the Government, that he represents here, is lacking in courage. You can rest assured on that. We have already conducted a test for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the World knows our capacity. And now the Hon. Member is saying that for 40 years we have indulged that in diplomatic activity. Is it his suggestion that we should go to war with the United States and Pakistan. That I submit, Sir, is not the proper approach. We should exhaust every possible peaceful diplomatic avenue. Having a nuclear conflict is not a joke. it is a very grave matter and it is the duty and responsibility of this Government to see that a peaceful arrangement is arrived at. But for him to suggest that we should go about making explosions, is if I may

respectfully say, is very odd, no responsible Government can respond to this kind of thing.

SHRI DINKARRAO GOVINDRAO PATIL: In the context of the U.S. stand being in favour of Pakistan, I want to know from the hon. Minister whether it is a fact that the justification for providing the nuclear weapons and also providing the airborne warning and control system advanced by the USA, is the Soviet presence in Afghanistan a patently bogus pretext, coming at a time when the USSR is committed to withdraw from there and when General Zia of Pakistan has himsef gone on record as having said that the Soviets do not pose any threat to his nation's security?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Have you understood anything? Then you can say something. Yes, Mr. Gurupadaswamy.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: Sir, I do not want to embarrass the Minister. But may I say, Sir, that there is no smoke without fire, Pakistan has actively engaged in producing atomic weapons. I think this country should assume that. Some time back, you are aware, you were a Minister of Defence also, the United States played a havoc with us in respect of the supply of Uranium to Tarapur plant, even though the Government of the USA had been committed to us for its supply. Now, Sir, this has gone from that position to another extremity of giving up commitment on non-proliferation, at least in respect of Pakistan. And now it is aiding, helping Pakistan in its programme to produce potentially dangerous atomic weapons in the near future. It is being helped by China also. Sir, this creates a grave security situation as my friend has already stated. I do not want him to commit himself on the floor of the House because I understand his predicament, the security climate is already changed in this sub-Continent. I want to know whether the Government would take all steps to see that the programme of Pakistan is properly met by a counter programme here? It has got a significance in what I say. Would he assure the Members of the House? You are equally concerned with the security of the country. So, will he assure us that for the security of the country no stone will be left unturned? Will he take all measures for protecting the security of the country?

SHRI K. NATWAR SINGH: It is my privilege to give that assurance to the hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next question.

Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh

*102. SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court at Chandigarh had not been functioning for over a year on account of the presiding Officer's post lying vacant;

(b) if so, what steps have been taken to mitigate the hardship caused thereby to the labour force particularly when an officer appointed as Presiding, Officer over five months back has yet to assume charge; and

(c) what was the number of cases pending in the said Court as on the 1st January and 1st October, 1986?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI P.A. SANGMA): (a) and (b) No, Sir. The post of Presiding Officer, Central Government Industrial Tribuanl-cum-Labour Court, Chandigarh, remained vacant from 16-4-1986 to 20-10-1986.

(c) On 1 January, 1986, 60 cases were pending while on 1 October, 1986, 86 cases were pending. The number of applications pending on these two dates were 531 and 577 respectively.